

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

May 15, 2001

LB 536

through greater demand and greater volume of production, recognize or realize economies of scale that would mean that the industry would need less subsidy from potentially both the state of Nebraska and the federal government, and I believe that then we would all be in a far better position if the subsidies did not have to be provided. I can only imagine that the producers, as business people, might feel better if they do not have to rely on government.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Time. Thank you, Senator Wickersham. Senator Redfield, on the motion to reconsider.

SENATOR REDFIELD: Thank you, Mr. Lieutenant Governor. Members of the body, I have been very quiet throughout this debate. I certainly have made no secret of the fact in past years that I have not supported mandates, but in fact I have supported any kind of production credits in the past for ethanol. We had a bill two years ago when I first came to this body and it was explained to me that, in fact, we were looking at a market in California that was ready for the picking. Because we were looking at MTBE and the effects on the environment at that time and that if we could just hang on to the ethanol industry in the state of Nebraska that when this opened in fact we would have an industry ready and able to go out there and fill that market. No subsidies would any longer be needed. In fact, we find ourselves three years later not having the California market open to us and here again looking at production credits. I thought it would be fair to explain to the body the evolution of the Redfield vote, because I had been a very solid vote for production credits for ethanol two years ago, three years ago. When this bill first came to committee, when we met in the Executive Session, the first time that we voted on this bill I actually voted to move this bill out. We didn't have enough votes at that time to do so and, subsequent to that, more information came into my hands and I became a "no" vote. If you look at your gizmo you'll see that on the Committee Statement I was a "no" vote on voting this bill out, and I'll explain to you why. I looked at the credit, the checkoff, that we were going to charge our farmers across the state and I would say that that would be a fair tax on them if they were, in fact, all to benefit. But when I looked at the information, what was given